

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/513 960	Applicant(s) Joel Plotkin	
	Examiner Igor Borissov	Art Unit 3629	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Rugy Ho (3) Igor Borissov
 (2) Thomas Dixon (4) _____

Date of Interview: 02/11/03

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 73

Identification of prior art discussed: Plantz and Hager et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see below


(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

The "disagreement" feature of claim 3 was discussed;
 not seen to be disclosed by Plantz and Hager et al.
 Examiner reserves the right to review the references further,
 or perform a new search to define said feature.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required